

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/786,042	Cote
	Examiner K. Menon	Art Unit 1723

All Participants:

(1) Examiner Menon

Status of Application: _____

(3) _____

(2) James Reiterman

(4) _____

Date of Interview: 18-Oct-2006

Time: 9:45am

Type of Interview:

- Telephonic
 Video Conference
 Personal (Copy given to: Applicant Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: Yes No

If Yes, provide a brief description: _____

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed: Antecedent basis in claims 27 & 28; lack of support for subject-matter of claims 32 and 36.

Claims discussed: 27, 28, 32, and 36

Prior art documents discussed: None.

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

Examiner Menon indicated the case could be allowed if the issues in claims 27, 28, 32 and 36 were addressed. Agreement was reached

- Part III.** on proposed amendments. Applicant to provide electronic copy of
- It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
 - It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

→ amended claims to Examiner Menon, for entry as an Examiner's Amendment (see attached two pages).

(Examiner/SPE Signature)

M. Reiterman #56,624
(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Subject: 10/786,042 Examiner Amendment

Date: Wednesday, October 18, 2006 10:56 AM

From: James Raakman <jraakman@bereskinparr.com>

To: <krishnan.menon@uspto.gov>

Conversation: 10/786,042 Examiner Amendment

Examiner Menon,

Please see the attached in furtherance of our telephone discussion this morning.

Regards,

James

--

James A. Raakman

B.Eng. (Mech. Eng.), LL.B.

Barrister & Solicitor

Patent Agent

Bereskin & Parr

Scotia Plaza, 40 King Street West, 40th Floor

Toronto, ON, Canada M5H 3Y2

Direct: 416.957.1654

jraakman@bereskinparr.com

This communication and any attachments may contain information that is privileged or confidential and is intended only for the use of the individual to whom it is addressed. Any other distribution, copying or disclosure is strictly prohibited. If you have received this communication in error, please notify us immediately then delete this communication. Thank you.

Examiner Menon,

This is further to our telephone conversation of earlier today, in which we discussed the following amendments to be entered as an examiner amendment:

Claim 27: The header of claim 26, wherein the second inner end outlet of the second resin injection duct is positioned in the second outer wall of the second protruding member.

Claim 28: (ok in view of changes to claim 27)

Claim 32: cancelled (in favour of new claim 38 presented below)

Claim 36:

For this claim, Applicant would like to request a slight change to the amendment you had proposed. My understanding is that you had proposed changing the last line as follows: "the injection duct comprising a bore passing through ~~at least one of the base and sidewalls~~ of the shell."

Applicant requests instead that Claim 36 be amended so that the last line reads: "the injection duct ~~comprising a bore~~ passing through ~~at least one of the base and sidewalls~~ of the shell."

Please confirm that this change to claim 36 meets your satisfaction.

Claim 38 (new): The header of claim 29, wherein the shell comprises a base and sidewalls joined to the base, the block of resin abutting the sidewalls, and the injection duct passing through one of the sidewalls.

I believe that the terms "injection duct" and "block of resin" in proposed claim 38 have proper antecedent basis in claim 20.